UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,010	05/07/2001	Kevin R. Marcus	INFS117139	3343

26389	7590	05/12/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER
VU, THONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	5

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/851,010	MARCUS, KEVIN R.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thong H Vu	2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 May 2001</u> .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 May 2001</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u>09/207,391</u> .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4</u> .	6) ☐ Other: .

1.   Claims 1-24 are pending. This is a Continuation in part of U.S. Application

09/207,391 filed 12/08/1998.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

I.Claims 1-3,8,9,16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Ambroziak [6,415,319].

2.   As per claim 1, Ambroziak discloses a method for executing a request on a

database, the method comprising:

obtaining a database execution request from a client computing device

[Ambroziak, a user request to a index server and database, col 5 lines 40-55; col 6 lines

59-65];

identifying a database record index associated with the corresponding record in

the database [Ambroziak an index controller identifying index information, col 5 lines 40-

55]; and processing the execution request with the identified database record index

[Ambroziak, processing by idenitifying the hyperlinks, col 6 lines 16-26; processing by

identifies any URLs, col 7 lines 50-65; process by index server, col 9 lines 1, 42-52]

3.   As per claim 2, Ambroziak discloses processing the execution request includes

accessing an information store, the information store including at least one database

utilized to process the execution request [Ambroziak, request to access, col 6 lines 43-

49;col 12 lines 10-32].

4.   As per claim 3, Ambroziak discloses processing the execution request includes

transmitting at least a portion of the execution request to a database object [Ambroziak

a portion of index, col 8 lines 13-28].

5.   As per claim 8, Ambroziak discloses a computer-readable medium having

computer-executable instructions [Ambroziak, Java programming language, col 5 lines

24-34].

6.   As per claim 9, Ambroziak discloses a computer system including a processor,

an operating environment, and a memory [Ambroziak system 100, Fig 1 col 5 lines 24-

34].

7.   As per claim 16, Ambroziak disclose the processed execution request includes a

proxy database record index, the proxy database record index corresponding to the

database record index as inherent feature of proxy database index [Ambroziak Fig 2,

col 5 lines 41-56].

8.   As per claim 17, Ambroziak discloses the execution request includes a proxy

database record index corresponding to the database record index [Ambroziak Fig 2,

col 5 lines 41-56].

II.Claims 4,5,10-15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lumsden [6,006,217] in view of Ng et al [Ng 6,374,256 B1].

9.   As per claim 10, Lumsden discloses a system for processing database execution

requests, the system comprising:

at least one client computing device operable to generate a database

execution request (search request) [Lumsden col 5 line 49-col 6 line 3]; and

an information processing system operable to obtain the execution request and

identify a database record index corresponding to the execution request, wherein the

information processing system is further operable to process the execution request with

the identified database record index [Lumsden col 3 lines 48-col 4 line 10, col 6 lines 4-

28];

However Lumsden did not teach the database execution request does not

include the identified database record index. Ng taught a method for creating indexes in

a database corresponding to classes in an Object-oriented application which enables a

user request indexing without specifying the implementation (identifier) of indexing in

the underlying database [Ng col 11 lines 10-20,55-67]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to incorporate the request without the identified

database index as taught by Ng into the Lumsden's apparatus in order to facilitate the multi database search. Doing so would provide a quick, security and easy process to search information via network databases.

10.   As per claim 11, Lumsden-Ng disclose the information processing system includes an information store, the information store including at least one database utilized to process the execution request [Ng, Fig 1].

11.   As per claim 12, Lumsden-Ng disclose the information processing server transmits the processed execution request to the client computing device, wherein the processed execution request does not include the database record index [Ng, Fig 1,col 11 lines 10-20].

12.   As per claim 13, Lumsden-Ng disclose at least one database object in communication with the information processing system, the database object operable to process the execution request [Ng, send request to database server, col 5 lines 20-39,50-62].

13.   As per claim 14, Lumsden-Ng disclose the database object transmits the processed execution request to the information processing system [Ng, send request to database server, col 5 lines 20-39,50-62].

14.   As per claim 15, Lumsden-Ng disclose the database object transmits the

processed execution request to the client computing device, wherein the processed

execution request does not include the database record index [Ng col 11 lines 10-20].

15.   Claims 4,5 and 22 contain the similar limitations set forth the reject claim 10.

Thus claims 4,5 and 22 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 10.

        III.Claims 6-7,18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Lumsden [6,006,217] in view of Herz et al [Herz 5,835,087]

16.   As per claim 18, Lumsden discloses a method for executing a request on a

database, the method comprising:

        obtaining a database execution request from a client computing device (search

request) [Lumsden col 3 line 48-col 4 line 10]

        However Lumsden did not teach the execution request including a proxy

database record index; correlating a database record index to the proxy database

record index; and processing the execution request with the database record index.

        Herz taught a customized electronic object ID system using a proxy server

database index, a pseudonum as a proxy database record identifier and corresponding

record to process the client request [Herz col 39 lines 10-24,col 45 line 48-col 46 line

28];

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to incorporate a proxy server database index and

corresponding record to process the client request as taught by Herz into the

Lumsden's apparatus in order to utilize the proxy server on the Internet environment.

Doing so would provide a quick, security and simple process to retrieve information via

Internet.

17.   As per claim 19, Lumsden-Herz disclose processing the execution request

includes accessing an information store, the information store including at least one

database utilized to process the execution request [Herz col 39 lines 10-24,col 45 line

48-col 46 line 28, col 71 lines 44-53].

18.   As per claim 20, Lumsden-Herz disclose processing the execution request

includes transmitting at least a portion of the execution request to a database object

[Herz col 39 lines 10-24,col 45 line 48-col 46 line 28].

19.   As per claim 21, Lumsden-Herz disclose processing the execution request

includes transmitting all the execution request to the database object [Herz col 39 lines

10-24,col 45 line 48-col 46 line 28].

20.   As per claim 23, Lumsden-Herz disclose a computer-readable medium having

computer-executable instructions [Lumsden col 5 lines 30-45].

21.   As per claim 24, Lumsden-Herz disclose an operating environment and a

memory [Lumsden Fig 1].

22.   As per claims 6-7 contain the similar limitations set forth the reject claim 18. Thus

claims 6-7 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 18.

23.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-
305-4643.
The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.
     If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Jack Harvey, can be reached at (703) 305-9705.
     Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should
be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.
     Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and
Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :
                        After Final   (703) 746-7238
                        Official: (703) 746-7239
                        Non-Official   (703) 746-7240
     Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142